

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNSEL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
December 13, 2002

Members Present:

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
James Bondurant
Daniel Edwards
Karl Heckart
Carol Merfeld
Greg Obuch
Ellie Price
Kyle Rimel

Members Not Present:

John Barrett
Ron Beguin

Sue Castaneda

Janet Cornell

David Davis

Joan Harphant

Will Tagart

Others Present:

Gary Graham

Jennifer Greene

Maureen Haggerty

Mark Jensen

Pam Peet

Robert Roll

INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

Discussion began with the status of electronic document management implementations. Mark Jensen, Maricopa Superior, and James Bondurant, Pinal Superior, summarized their progress and some of the problems they've encountered.

Members then began to discuss issues to formulate specific recommendations related to technical recommendations made in the report from the Public Access to Court Electronic Records Committee.

The key recommendations in the report were reviewed. The "pilot project" recommendation was discussed. Multiple courts could participate with the three-year focus on the evaluation of the impacts, processes and procedures surrounding the provision of public access to criminal case documents.

The Technical Advisory Council generally agreed that approaches recommended by PAECR were technically feasible.

Mo Abdulaziz demonstrated the *efiler* application used in Court of Appeals, Division 2. The document delivery approach was then discussed.

In the pilot period, because of limited funding and infrastructure, TAC recommends limited off-hours delivery of documents requested. The registered public user would be presented with a "shopping cart approach" to selecting

documents it wishes to have. Those documents would then be selected and emailed to the user during low volume processing hours. There was controversy on this and immediate on-line access, as in *efiler*, was also discussed.

For registration and authentication, it is recommended that it be centralized and industry-standard, "canned" ecommerce products are readily available for this. Authentication would be "payment method based" (i.e. use of a credit card) or a government issued identification. There would be, however, a way to allow parties access without charge. A concern was that the system be financially self-sufficient.

Data mining of web sites was discussed. All agreed it can and should be limited.

Two other entities (the federal PACER system and Maryland's document access system) were both discussed, especially with respect to approaches (flat fee, per page or time used) to charging for services. The PACER system has a staff of 12 to provide customer service, technical support of centralized access to local data stores (including documents) and billing (charges tracked by page delivered on-line) functions. Maryland now charges a flat fee for access to case docket information (not documents) after experiencing the considerable overhead required to track and bill actual usage when they first implemented. The PACER federal pilot for providing documents on-line (noted above) will issue a report next September. We will get that report and use their experience to assist in our decision-making.

Web statistics were briefly discussed. WebTrends and FunnelWeb reports from Maricopa Superior and the AOC, respectively, were provided as samples. With the variety of affordable software available, web usage can be reported. Members agreed that the business users must identify what they wanted counted and define their information needs. Generally, number of sessions and number of cases viewed were considered key to understanding the volume of use of a site.

Carol Merfeld summarized the status of the report generator software evaluation. They have done site visits on potential products and have one more left. They have also met with AOC to review techniques for using the database views as a tool in report generation.

Finally, Karl provided an update on the status and current objectives of the centralized compliance bureau study.